UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/736,848	12/17/2003	Carl Joseph Kraenzel	042846-0312967	5441	
909 7590 03/20/2008 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP P.O. BOX 10500			EXAMINER		
			MADAMBA, GLENFORD J		
MCLEAN, VA 22102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2151		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/20/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/736,848	KRAENZEL, CARL JOSEPH		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	Glefilord Madamba	2131	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 December 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidaveal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	•	TE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	• •		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a €	corresponding number of finally rei	acted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11		mpliant Amondment (DTOL 324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		inpliant Amendment (F10L-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all 		timely filed amendmen	at canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	lowable ii subifilited iii a separate,	uniely filed afficildifier	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-57</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>7-07.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	() NOT I II II II II II	PC 6 H	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		n condition for allowan	ce because:
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). 13. ☐ Other: 	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/John Follansbee/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Office has fully considered Applicant's arguments but has deemed them unpersuasive to overcome the rejection of the claim under Bode in view of Fratkina. Specifically, with regards to the claim, while Bode discloses substantial features of the invention, the additionally amended feature of "a communication between a user associated with the remote client and at least one other individual' is expressly taught and/or disclosed by Fratkina, which is not only a related endeavor but also expressly incorporated by reference.

Fratkina discloses as his invention a method and system for retrieving information through the use of a multi-stage interaction with a client to identify particular knowledge content associated with a knowledge map. Specifically, Fratkina discloses the above said amended feature of a communication between a user associated with the remote client and at least one other individual [Figs. 19-21] (e.g., Escalation causing a "live chat" type of interaction with a human to appear within the user's web

browser) [0225]. The argued feature of a "communication between a user associated with the remote client and at least one other individual" is disclosed..